

as is due all who encourage further bloodshed. In view of the fact that all aggressive war is indefensible it seems strange that any reader of *The Public* should consider any other verdict possible. There is no moral difference between the attitude of these English papers, and of the American papers which demanded intervention in Mexico, or of German papers which oppose peace except on terms that can not be obtained without further bloodshed. Every agency, whether English, German, French, Austrian or Russian, which encourages prolonging of the war for a single day, occupies a position morally indefensible. That nation will be the first to cease adding to its load of guilt and dishonor which first becomes willing to accept the best peace terms obtainable without further fighting.

S. D.



A Fair Deal for All.

Some weeks ago a plea was made to the religious zealots who were accusing *The Public* of being partial to their opponents, that they take a broader view of the matter and exercise a little more charity toward their fellows. Since each accused the paper of being favorable to the other side, it was possible that both were wrong. And now a similar difficulty has arisen over the European war. The pro-Germans think the paper is partial to the Allies; while the anti-Germans declare it favors the Germans. What better can *The Public* do than to let its accusers speak for themselves? From liberty-loving Massachusetts come these words:

For the last year I had enjoyed very much the articles printed in *The Public*, because in most of them any one could see a spirit of fairness; but I am very sorry to say that I have noticed since the beginning of the European war that spirit of fairness regarding the same has greatly vanished. You will probably say it is because I am a Frenchman. If so, you are very much mistaken (in the first place France doesn't need German sympathy, Germany needs it all and more too) because I have asked of persons of other nationalities what they thought of the *Public's* attitude in this matter. They said they could smell German in all the lines written about the war. . . . We don't want any more Napoleons, and the Kaiser thinks he is a second one, but the first one was a great man apart from his bloody wars, and in ten short years accomplished a great deal, while this idiot of Kaiser, the first war he undertakes will mean his Waterloo. And instead of being looked on as a great warrior he will be held by the future generations as the greatest criminal of them all. . . . Please discontinue sending the paper, since you have to write thus to please the Germans in the United States. That's what I have been told by people who have lived in the West.

But *The Public* is defended from these pro-German charges by one who writes from the great State of Illinois, and not more than a day's journey from the town where Elijah Lovejoy was mobbed for daring to speak his mind. Let it be noted, too, with what enthusiasm the defense is made:

Although I know the few following lines are so much labor lost, you seeming to be so blinded by prejudice that you could not distinguish between a shotgun and a barndoor, nevertheless let me suggest a wee bit more modesty in making charges. You talk about Prussian—that seems to lie heavy on your stomach—atrocities as though you had [stood] by and seen, or as though you had the documents in your pocket that clearly prove your assertion. If you will just make a slight change in your statement, and make it suffered instead of committed, you will be more than justified. The Belgian's warfare has been that of a ferocious wild beast that ought to be cleared off the face of the earth to make room for something better. It is a pity that the *Public* that has been this long number of years so notoriously fair must fall in your hands to soil its pages with your vicious unfairness.

There, what paper was ever more thoroughly cleared of the charge of partiality than *The Public*? That the paper has not favored the Allies is proven beyond the shadow of a doubt by the direct testimony of a Frenchman. That the paper has not been partial to the Germans is equally well proven by the unqualified evidence of a German. Or, looked at from a different point of view, though *The Public* might be guilty of bias toward one side or the other, it manifestly is impossible that it should be biased toward both sides; and since each critic declares so emphatically that it does not lean toward his side, is it not possible that it may stand upright between?



The Public does not raise this question for the purpose of self-laudation, nor would it do so if these were the only letters of the kind that had been received. Other well-meaning persons, filled with patriotic zeal, have written to say the paper is biased toward the other side. This does not in any way harm the editors, but it may very seriously handicap the correspondents themselves in their efforts to better conditions in this world. The editors have kept their personal opinions on the war out of *The Public*, not because they had none, but because they believed such expressions of opinion would do no good among its readers at this time. They hold that it is of small moment which of a number of armed men in a frontier town is first to pull his gun, or what may be the technical points of honor involved. They are op-

posed to this gun-toting, man-killing practice in this day and age; and they are doing what they can toward bringing about the disarmament of nations. It is not a question as to whether the war was forced upon Germany, or imposed upon France; nor yet is it a question of Germany's whipping the Allies or of the Allies beating Germany. Rifles are poor instruments for determining truth, or for establishing justice. But, presumably, the war will end ultimately; and when it does end The Public hopes to see the nations disarm, and Justice come into her own.



To such as revile the paper, and accuse it of unfairness, this may be said: You may feel disappointed that The Public does not advocate your cause during the present war, but are you justified in charging it with standing for the other side? President Wilson has voiced the highest sentiment in calling upon Americans to remain neutral. These are portentous times. It is possible that this country may be the means of securing a lasting peace at the conclusion of present hostilities. But such a service cannot be performed by one holding the views expressed in either our French or German correspondent. Rather must it come from a people who, realizing their own delinquencies and shortcomings, yet having done a little toward setting up a democracy and establishing the rights of man, can say in all gentleness and sincerity: Here is a plan by which we have accomplished something; try it; we can all accomplish more by working together.

s. c.



Paying Twice for the Same Thing.

Chicago has been trying for a number of years to establish a system of outer parks that shall embrace spacious woodlands, dells, and picturesque spots in a state of nature. The question has been voted affirmatively twice at the polls, but has been defeated both times by some flaw or technicality. It will come up a third time at the November election. The interesting feature about the matter is that whereas the lands needed for these extensive parks could have been bought for five million dollars when the question first came up, the same lands will now cost fifteen million dollars. As these lands are all unimproved, the question arises, why the advance? Complaints are heard of the rise in the cost of living and of war prices; but food stuffs have shown no such soaring propensities as these wild lands. The owners of these lands have done nothing to them aside from a few

little touches to change their appearance. But there is one decided change. Whereas these lands were then in touch with a city of a million people, they are now in touch with a city of two and a half million people. It is quite clear that the people of the city as a whole have conferred this added value to these lands; and it is equally plain that under our present method of doing things the people who trebled the value of these lands will have to pay for them a second time before they can use them.

s. c.



Senator Sherman and the Singletax

In a public statement on September 27 Senator Lawrence Y. Sherman, of Illinois, unconsciously but none the less openly and clearly, admitted the superior fitness of his Progressive opponent for the Senatorship, Raymond Robins. The admission was in an allusion to the fact that Robins has a better grasp of economic principles than he, and is more willing to advocate just principles. All of this was involved in Sherman's reference to Robins as an advocate of the Singletax and his own confession of ignorance of and opposition to the principle. He further declared that while social justice legislation was being enacted and he was writing statutes, Robins was advocating Singletax. Well, whatever statutes Sherman may have been writing, it is clear that they have failed to establish social justice. They must have been the kind of statutes, the writers of which thunder loudly against evil conditions, but carefully avoid disturbing the causes of these conditions, or offending the beneficiaries. They must have been such statutes, the writing of which gives aid and comfort to predatory interests, because it deludes the public into a false belief that something effective is about to be done. While Sherman was thus engaged, Raymond Robins was endeavoring to show the people the right road to justice. For this he has earned the opposition of the Illinois plunderbund, and the reproaches of Senator Sherman.



What are Senator Sherman's objections to the Singletax? According to the Chicago Tribune they are as follows: "It is taking from those who have and giving to those who have not. It is a leveling of possessions. It is an equality of economic opportunity." In view of the fact that these objections were offered without so much as a word to show that the Senator has the slightest idea of what the Singletax is, his objections may safely be attributed to ignorance. He objects to the Singletax; first, because "it is taking from those who